arXiv:1510.04920v2 [math-ph] 21 Dec 2015

Extremal positive maps on $M_3(\mathbb{C})$ and idempotent matrices

Marek Miller*[1] and Robert Olkiewicz†[1]

[1]Institute of Theoretical Physics, Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Poland

December 22, 2015

Abstract

A new method of analysing positive bistochastic maps on the algebra of complex matrices M_3 has been proposed. By identifying the set of such maps with a convex set of linear operators on $\mathbb{R}^8$, one can employ techniques from the theory of compact semigroups to obtain results concerning asymptotic properties of positive maps. It turns out that the idempotent elements play a crucial role in classifying the convex set into subsets, in which representations of extremal positive maps are to be found. It has been show that all positive bistochastic maps, extremal in the set of all positive maps of M_3, that are not Jordan isomorphisms of M_3 are represented by matrices that fall into two possible categories, determined by the simplest idempotent matrices: one by the zero matrix, and the other by a one dimensional orthogonal projection. Some norm conditions for matrices representing possible extremal maps have been specified and examples of maps from both categories have been brought up, based on the results published previously.

Keywords: positive maps, extremal, idempotent, semigroup.

Introduction

Positive maps of operator algebras constitute a rich area of research, directly connected to the theory of quantum entanglement. In 1990s, A. Peres and P. M. R. Horodeckis pointed out at the intrinsic relation between separable states of composite quantum systems and positive maps of algebras of observables [12, 8]. The well established criterion of separability, proposed in the mentioned papers, reveals a one-to-one correspondence between positive maps and entanglement witnesses [5]. This *Peres-Horodecki criterion*, originally proposed for maps on algebras M_n of square complex matrices of size n, which holds true even in the most general setting of injective von Neumann algebras [9], is computationally feasible as long as the structure of general positive maps

*marek.miller@ift.uni.wroc.pl
†robert.olkiewicz@ift.uni.wroc.pl

on operator algebras representing a composite quantum system in question is known. To this day, the complete characterisation of positive maps have been obtained only for the algebra M_2 and the maps between M_2 and M_3 [14, 16].

To analyse the structure of positive maps in the simplest, still unresolved case of maps on M_3, we propose a continuation of the reasoning conducted in our previous paper [10]. We have established a connection between positive maps that preserve both the trace of matrices and the identity matrix, the so-called bistochastic maps, and their stable subspaces that have the structure of Jordan algebras. Here, we go one step further and explore the relation between those stable subspaces and the idempotent real matrices that represent the conditional expectations projecting onto the spaces. To this end, we employ mostly geometrical techniques that allowed us before to establish the structure theorem for maps on the algebra M_2 [11], as well as the methods from the theory of compact semigroups [13, 4].

The main result of this paper makes possible to outline a program, suggesting where the extremal positive maps on M_3 are to be found with respect to their connection to associated idempotents (see Theorem 3 below). We have shown that all positive bistochastic maps, extremal in the set of all positive maps of M_3, that are not Jordan isomorphisms of M_3 are represented by matrices that fall into two possible categories, determined by the simplest idempotent matrices: one by the zero matrix, and the other by a one dimensional orthogonal projection. As a corollary, we specify some norm conditions for matrices representing possible extremal maps. The structure of the paper concentrates on building a mathematical framework necessary to prove the final result. We start with a brief listing of necessary notation and definitions.

1 Preliminaries

Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ be grater than 0. Let $M_n = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ denote the algebra of complex square matrices of size n. The algebra of real matrices will always be denoted explicitly by $M_n(\mathbb{R})$. For $A \in M_n$, the norm $||A||$ is understood to be the standard operator norm, i.e. the maximal singular value of the matrix A. For the Hilbert-Schmidt norm (HS-norm) of A, we reserve the symbol $||A||_{HS} = \sqrt{\mathrm{tr} A^* A}$, where tr denotes the trace operation, and A^* is the conjugate-transpose of A. The HS-norm of A can be computed as the sum of squares of singular values of A. The Hilbert-Schmidt inner product, induced by the HS-norm, is defined as $\langle A, B\rangle_{HS} = \mathrm{tr} A^* B$, for $A, B \in M_n$. The identity matrix of M_n, we denote by $\mathbf{1}_n$, or simply $\mathbf{1}$, and the null matrix by $\hat{0}$.

We say that a matrix $A \in M_n$ is positive-semidefinite, or simply *positive*, if the inner product $\langle \eta, A\eta\rangle \geq 0$, for any vector $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^n$ (i.e. $A = A^*$ and A has a non-negative spectrum). A linear map $S\colon M_n \to M_n$ is said to be positive, indicated: $S \geq 0$, if for any $A \in M_n$ such that $A \geq 0$, we have $S(A) \geq 0$. The operator norm of the linear map S is given by

$$||S|| = \sup\{\, ||S(A)||,\ A \in M_n,\ ||A|| = 1\}\,. \tag{1.1}$$

It is true that if S is positive, then $||S|| = ||S(\mathbf{1})||$. Any positive map is Hermitian, i.e. $S(A^*) = S(A)^*$, for all $A \in M_n$. The identity map of M_n is labelled I_n, or simply I. The convex cone of all positive maps of M_n is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(M_n)$. A positive map S is extremal, if for any positive map $T : M_n \to M_n$ such that $S - T \in \mathcal{P}(M_n)$, i.e. $0 \leq T \leq S$, we have $T = \alpha S$ for some number $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. It is true that every positive map can be written as a convex combination of extremal ones. If $S\colon M_n \to M_n$ is a

positive map such that $S(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathrm{tr}S(A) = \mathrm{tr}A$, for any $A \in M_n$, then we call it *bistochastic*, or *doubly stochastic*.

From now on, let us fix $n = 3$. We choose the set of normalised Gell-Mann matrices, $\{\lambda_\mu\}_{\mu=0}^8$, by taking:

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\lambda_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_5 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_6 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\lambda_7 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_8 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\mathbf{1}_3$; which is an orthonormal basis for M_3 with respect to the HS inner product. Any self-adjoint matrix $A = A^* \in M_3$ can be written as $A = \lambda(a)$, where $\lambda(a) = \sum_{\mu=0}^8 a_\mu\lambda_\mu$, and $a = (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_8) \in \mathbb{R}^9$. Sometimes, we will use a simplified notation: $a = (a_0, \vec{a})$, where $\vec{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_8) \in \mathbb{R}^8$, and $\lambda(a) = \lambda(a_0, \vec{a}) = a_0\lambda_0 + \vec{a}\cdot\vec{\lambda}$. For $a = (a_0, \vec{a})$ and $b = (b_0, \vec{b})$, we have $\langle\lambda(a), \lambda(b)\rangle_{HS} = a_0b_0 + \vec{a}\cdot\vec{b}$. For a bistochastic map S, let us define a matrix $x \in M_8(\mathbb{R})$ by $x_{ij} = \mathrm{tr}\lambda_i S(\lambda_j)$, $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, 8$. Then it is easy to see that S acts on a self-adjoint matrix by

$$S(\lambda(a_0, \vec{a})) = \lambda(a_0, x\vec{a}). \tag{1.2}$$

For a matrix $x \in M_8(\mathbb{R})$, we denote a linear map on M_3 that preserves both the identity and trace, defined by the relation (1.2), by S_x. Let $\Lambda \subset M_8(\mathbb{R})$ be a set of those real matrices x, for which S_x is a bistochastic map: $\Lambda = \{x \in M_8(\mathbb{R}) \mid S_x \geq 0\}$. Therefore, there is a one-to-one correspondence between Λ and the set of bistochastic maps on M_3. The mapping $S_x \mapsto x$ is in fact a semigroup isomorphism, for which $S_x^* = S_{x^t}$, where generally S^* denotes the HS-adjoint map of S, given by: $\mathrm{tr}\, S^*(A)B = \mathrm{tr}AS(B)$, for all $A, B \in M_3$. The structure of the set Λ is fairly complicated. First, it is a closed convex set, i.e. for any $x, y \in \Lambda$, $\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y \in \Lambda$, for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. Moreover, is is a compact, convex and real topological semigroup (see e.g. [13, 4] for the definitions) with involution being the matrix transposition: $A \mapsto A^t$. Obviously, $S_{\mathbf{1}_8} = I$. The structure of the set analogous to Λ, but representing maps on the algebra M_2, has been studied using geometrical methods in [11]. Because there is no such geometrical identification for $n = 3$, this time we exploit the semigroup aspect of the set Λ.

Proposition 1. *Let $\overline{K}_r(\hat{0})$ denote a closed ball in $M_8(\mathbb{R})$ with respect to the operator norm, centred around $\hat{0}$, with radius $r > 0$. Then*

$$\overline{K}_{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{0}) \subset \Lambda \subset \overline{K}_1(\hat{0}). \tag{1.3}$$

Proof. Suppose that $x \in M_8(\mathbb{R})$ and $||x|| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Let $\vec{m}, \vec{n} \in \mathbb{R}^8$ be such that $P_{\vec{m}} = \lambda(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \vec{n})$ and $P_{\vec{n}} = \lambda(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \vec{m})$ are orthogonal projections in M_3. It is easy to check that

in that case $||\vec{m}||_2 = ||\vec{n}||_2 = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$, where $||\cdot||_2$ denotes the standard Euclidean norm. Because $||x|| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have that

$$\operatorname{tr} P_{\vec{m}} S_x(P_{\vec{n}}) = \frac{1}{3} + \langle \vec{m}, x\vec{n} \rangle \geq \frac{1}{3} - |\langle \vec{m}, x\vec{n} \rangle| \geq 0. \tag{1.4}$$

Hence S_x is positive, which means that $x \in \Lambda$.

Let now $x \in \Lambda$. Then for any $A = A^* \in M_3$, S_x fulfils the *Kadison-Schwarz inequality* [2]:

$$S(A)^2 \leq S(A^2). \tag{1.5}$$

Let $\vec{n} \in \mathbb{R}^8$; since $\lambda(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \vec{n})$ is self-adjoint, by (1.5) and by the fact that S_x preserves trace, we have

$$\frac{1}{3} + ||x\vec{n}||_2^2 = \operatorname{tr} \left(S_x(\lambda(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \vec{n}) \right)^2 \leq \operatorname{tr} S \left(\lambda(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \vec{n})^2 \right) = \operatorname{tr} \lambda(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \vec{n})^2 = \frac{1}{3} + ||\vec{n}||_2^2. \tag{1.6}$$

Hence, $||x\vec{n}||_2 \leq ||\vec{n}||_2$, for any $\vec{n} \in \mathbb{R}^8$, which means that $x \in \overline{K}_1(\hat{0})$. □

Let $P_8 \in M_8(\mathbb{R})$ denote a diagonal matrix $P_8 = \operatorname{diag}(0,0,0,0,0,0,0,1)$; and so on for other sets of indices: $P_{38} = \operatorname{diag}(0,0,1,0,0,0,0,1)$, etc. It is easy to check that all matrices: $P_8, P_{38}, P_{138}, P_{1238}, P_{13468}$ are idempotent elements belonging to Λ. In addition, there are no idempotent elements in Λ of rank 6 or 7, and the only idempotent of rank 8 is the identity $\mathbf{1}_8$. That fact will become clear in the light of the proof of Theorem 2 below (see Remark 5). Let also $G_3 = \operatorname{Ad} \mathrm{SU}(3) \subset \Lambda$ denotes the group of those matrices $g \in \Lambda$ such that S_g is an automorphism: $S_g(A) = UAU^*$, for a unitary matrix $U \in \mathrm{SU}(3)$ and for any $A \in M_3$. It is evident that $G_3 \subset \mathrm{SO}(8)$, the special group of orthogonal matrices. The set of those $x \in \Lambda$ such that S_x is a bistochastic map, extremal in the set of all positive maps on M_3 (not necessarily bistochastic), is denoted by $\operatorname{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$, whereas the set of extremal points of the convex set Λ is labelled as $\operatorname{Ext}(\Lambda)$. The matrix $x \in \operatorname{Ext}(\Lambda)$, if and only if for all $y_1, y_2 \in \Lambda$ and $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, if $x = \lambda y_1 + (1-\lambda) y_2$, then $y_1 = y_2 = x$. It is true that $\operatorname{Ext}_0(\Lambda) \subset \operatorname{Ext}(\Lambda)$. The next fact follows from Proposition 1.

Proposition 2. *Let $x \in \operatorname{Ext}(\Lambda)$. Suppose that $||x|| = \frac{1}{2}$; then $x = \frac{1}{2}R$, for $R \in \mathrm{O}(8)$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \operatorname{Ext}(\Lambda)$ and $||x|| = \frac{1}{2}$. Let $x = R|x|$ be the polar decomposition of x, $R \in \mathrm{O}(8)$, $|x| = \sqrt{x^t x}$. Suppose that $|x| \neq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_8$. Let $y_1 = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_8$ and $y_2 = 2|x| - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_8$. Then $-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_8 \leq y_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_8$, so $||y_2|| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and by Proposition 1, we have that both $Ry_1, Ry_2 \in \Lambda$. Then $x = \frac{1}{2}Ry_1 + \frac{1}{2}Ry_2$, and thus it cannot be extremal, a contradiction. Hence, $x = \frac{1}{2}R$. □

Remark 1. By Proposition 1, we see that $x \in \operatorname{Ext}(\Lambda)$ implies that $||x|| \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, $x = \frac{1}{2}R$, $R \in \mathrm{O}(8)$, are the only possible elements in $\operatorname{Ext}(\Lambda)$, and so in $\operatorname{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$, with the norm $||x|| = \frac{1}{2}$.

2 Idempotent and extremal elements of Λ

Let $x \in \Lambda$ and let $\langle x \rangle \subset \Lambda$ be the semigroup generated by x: $\langle x \rangle = \left\{ x^k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 1 \right\}$. By $\overline{\langle x \rangle}$, we denote the closure of $\langle x \rangle$ in $M_8(\mathbb{R})$. The proof of the following proposition is presented in [13, Lemma 3].

Proposition 3. *Since Λ is closed, $\overline{\langle x\rangle} \subset \Lambda$. The set $\overline{\langle x\rangle}$ contains a unique idempotent, denoted by e_x.*

Definition 1. For the set Λ, we define the following subsets:

1. the set of idempotents of Λ: $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda) = \left\{e \in \Lambda \mid e^2 = e\right\}$;
2. the set of nilpotent elements: $\mathcal{N}(\Lambda) = \left\{x \in \Lambda \mid \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} x^n = \hat{0}\right\}$;
3. the group of invertible elements: $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) = \{x \in \Lambda \mid \exists\, y \in \Lambda, xy = yx = \mathbf{1}_8\}$.

For an idempotent element $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$, we define the following subsets of Λ:

1. let $H(e)$ be the maximal subgroup of Λ containing $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$;
2. $Q(e) = \{x \in \Lambda \mid e_x = e\}$, where e_x is the unique idempotent element of $\overline{\langle x\rangle}$.

Remark 2. It is a known fact from the semigroup theory that for each idempotent element of a semigroup, there is exactly one maximal subgroup containing it. In particular, in our case of the semigroup Λ, $H(\hat{0}) = \left\{\hat{0}\right\}$, $H(\mathbf{1}_8) = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, obviously, and moreover $H(P_8) = \{P_8\}$. Indeed, if the matrix elements of x are $(x_{ij})_{i,j=1}^8$, then from the fact that $x \in H(P_8)$, follows $x = xP_8 = P_8x$ (x belongs to the maximal group containing P_8, and the idempotent P_8 is the identity for that group). Hence, $x = P_8\, x P_8 = x_{88} P_8$. Because there is a sequence of natural numbers n_k, $k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$, such that $x^{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} P_8$, so $|x_{88}| = 1$. But $-P_8 \notin \Lambda$, and thus $x = P_8$.

The following proposition, proven in general terms in [13, Theorem 8], will be repeatedly used in the subsequent reasoning.

Proposition 4. *Let $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$. Then $H(e) = e\, Q(e) = Q(e)\, e$.*

Proof. Observe that the semigroup Λ fulfils the assumptions of [13, Theorem 8]. □

Remark 3. It is true that $Q(\hat{0}) = \mathcal{N}(\Lambda)$. Indeed, let $x \in Q(\hat{0})$, then by definition, there is a sequence of natural numbers n_k such that $x^{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} \hat{0}$. For some fixed k, for any $l \geq n_k$, since $||x|| \leq 1$ (see Proposition 1), one has $||x^l|| \leq ||x^{l-n_k}||\, ||x^{n_k}|| \leq ||x^{n_k}||$. Hence $x^l \xrightarrow{l} \hat{0}$ and $Q(\hat{0}) \subset \mathcal{N}(\Lambda)$. The reverse inclusion is obvious. Moreover, since we have that $H(\mathbf{1}_8) = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, by Proposition 4, $H(\mathbf{1}_8) = Q(\mathbf{1}_8) \cdot \mathbf{1}_8$, and hence $Q(\mathbf{1}_8) = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$.

Our task is to analyse the family of sets $\{Q(e), e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)\}$, and in particular, to show, where among this family the elements of $\mathrm{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$ are to be found. To this end, we present the following series of results.

Proposition 5. *For $e_1, e_2 \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$, $e_1 \neq e_2$, the sets $Q(e_1)$ and $Q(e_2)$ are disjoint. Moreover, $\Lambda = \bigcup\limits_{e\in\mathcal{E}(\Lambda)} Q(e)$.*

Proof. If $e_1 \neq e_2$, by Proposition 3, the sets $Q(e_1)$ and $Q(e_2)$ must be disjoint. For $x \in \Lambda$, we have that $x \in Q(e_x) \subset \Lambda$, and the assertion follows. □

It should be noted that for $g \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, because $||g|| \leq 1$ (see Proposition 1), and $g^{-1} \in \Lambda$, then $||g|| = 1$. Thus, g is an orthogonal matrix. In particular, for any $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$, $geg^t \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$.

Lemma 1. *Let $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$. Then $Q(geg^t) = gQ(e)g^t = \left\{gxg^t \mid x \in Q(e)\right\}$.*

Proof. It is clear that $g\overline{\langle x\rangle}g^t = \overline{\langle gxg^t\rangle}$. Because the mapping $x \mapsto gxg^t$ is a homeomorphism, so $g\overline{\langle x\rangle}g^t = \overline{\langle gxg^t\rangle}$. Let $x \in Q(geg^t)$. Then $geg^t \in \overline{\langle x\rangle}$. Hence $e \in g^t\overline{\langle x\rangle}g = \overline{\langle g^txg\rangle}$. This in turn means that $g^txg \in Q(e)$, i.e. $x \in gQ(e)g^t$, which establishes that $Q(geg^t) \subset gQ(e)g^t$. The reverse inclusion follows from an analogous reasoning. □

Next, we describe the structure of the set of idempotents in Λ. For $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$, let $\mathcal{E}_{G_3}(e) = \{geg^t \mid g \in G_3\}$. At first, in the following lemma, we recall a known fact that an idempotent contractive operator on a Hilbert space is an orthogonal projection (see e.g. [1, Problem 5.3.14]).

Lemma 2. *Let $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$, then $e^t = e$, and hence, e is an orthogonal projection in $M_8(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. Because $e^2 = e$, so $||e|| = ||e^2|| \leq ||e||^2$, hence $||e|| \geq 1$. Since $e \in \Lambda$, by Proposition 1, $||e|| = 1$. Suppose that $\vec{n} \in \ker e$ and $\vec{m} \in \mathcal{R}(e)$, the range of the operator e. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$||\alpha\vec{m}||^2 = ||P(\vec{n} + \alpha\vec{m})||^2 \leq ||\vec{n} + \alpha\vec{m}||^2 \leq ||\vec{n}||^2 + 2\alpha\langle\vec{n}, \vec{m}\rangle + ||\alpha\vec{m}||^2, \tag{2.1}$$

i.e. $||\vec{n}||^2 + 2\alpha\langle\vec{n}, \vec{m}\rangle \geq 0$, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. It means that $\langle\vec{n}, \vec{m}\rangle = 0$, for every $\vec{n} \in \ker e$ and $\vec{m} \in \mathcal{R}(e)$, i.e. $\ker e \perp \mathcal{R}(e)$, which proves that $e = e^t$. □

Proposition 6. *Let $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ and $h \in H(e)$. Then $h^t \in H(e)$, and $h^th = hh^t = e$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4, $H(e) = Q(e)e = e\,Q(e)$. If $x \in Q(e)$, then $x^t \in Q(e)$, by Lemma 2. Hence, $h^t \in H(e)$. Since e is a projection, $e \leq \mathbf{1}_8$; moreover $h^th \leq \mathbf{1}_8$, because $h \in \Lambda$. Thus, $\hat{0} \leq (h^th)^k \leq h^th = eh^the \leq e$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If n_k is a sequence of natural numbers such that $(h^th)^{n_k} \overset{k}{\to} e$, we obtain that $h^th = e$. By the same reasoning, we have also: $hh^t = e$. □

Let us recall that for a bistochastic map S, by K_S we denote the stable subspace of S defined by (see [10, Eq. (3.3)]):

$$K_S = \left\{x \in M_3 \mid \forall k \in \mathbb{N}\ ||S^kx||_{HS} = ||S^{*k}x||_{HS} = ||x||_{HS}\right\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where S^* is the adjoint map of S. The fact that $H(\mathbf{1}_8) = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ can be generalised to the following result.

Theorem 1. *Let $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ and K_{S_e} be the stable subspace of the map S_e. Then K_{S_e} is a Jordan algebra and $H(e) \cong Aut_J\, K_{S_e}$, the group of Jordan automorphisms of K_{S_e}.*

Proof. Because e is idempotent, by [10, Corollary 3], the space $K_{S_e} = S_e(M_3)$ is a Jordan algebra. The map S_e is in fact the conditional expectation onto K_{S_e}. Let $h \in H(e)$. By Proposition 6, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $S_h^{*k}S_h^k = S_{h^t}^kS_h^k = S_{(h^t)^kh^k} = S_e$, and the same for $S_h^kS_h^{*k} = S_e$. Thus, the stable algebra $K_{S_h} = K_{S_e}$ (compare [10], eq. (3.3) and below). Again, by [10, Corollary 3], $\varphi_h = S_h\big|_{K_{S_e}}$ is a Jordan automorphism of the Jordan algebra K_{S_e}.

On the other hand, if φ is an arbitrary Jordan automorphism of $K_{S_e} \subset M_3$, then it could be extended to a bistochastic map S_h on M_3, for some $h \in \Lambda$, by $S_h = \varphi \circ S_e$. Then $S_hS_e = S_h = S_eS_h$, because S_e acts as the identity map on K_{S_e}. Hence, $he = eh = h$. In addition, since φ is invertible on K_{S_e}, by extending φ^{-1} to another bistochastic map $S_{h'}$, $h' \in \Lambda$, we show that $h' \in H(e)$ and $h'h = hh' = e$, which proves that $h \in H(e)$. □

Remark 4. From the above theorem, since $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) = H(\mathbf{1}_8)$, we infer that the group $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ consists of those matrices that represent Jordan isomorphism on M_3, i.e. for any $g \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, there is a unitary matrix $U \in \mathrm{SU}(3)$ such that either $S_g(A) = UAU^*$ or $S_g(A) = UA^tU^*$ for all $A \in M_3$.

Theorem 2. *The set $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ is a sum of seven disjoint subsets:*

$$\mathcal{E}(\Lambda) = \bigcup_{e_0 \in J} \mathcal{E}_{G_3}(e_0), \tag{2.3}$$

where $J = \left\{\hat{0}, P_8, P_{38}, P_{138}, P_{1238}, P_{13468}, \mathbf{1}_8\right\}$.

Proof. If $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$, then as above, S_e is a conditional expectation map onto the Jordan algebra K_{S_e}. By Theorems 5.3.8 and 6.2.3 of [7], all Jordan subalgebras of M_3 are isomorphic (unitary equivalent) to one of the following: $\mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbb{C}E_{12} \oplus \mathbb{C}E_3$, $\mathbb{C}E_1 \oplus \mathbb{C}E_2 \oplus \mathbb{C}E_3$, $M_2^s \oplus \mathbb{C}E_3$, $M_2 \oplus \mathbb{C}E_3$, M_3^s, and M_3 itself; where M_k^s is the Jordan algebra of symmetric matrices of size k: $M_k^s = \{A \in M_k : A = A^t\}$; $E_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, are matrix units with 1 at the ith diagonal entry and 0 elsewhere, and $E_{12} = E_1 + E_2$. Hence, there is $g \in G_3$ such that $e = ge_0g^t$, and e_0 is the orthogonal projection that represents the projection map onto precisely one of the algebras mentioned above. It is straightforward to check that then $e_0 \in J$, and $\dim e_0 + 1$ is equal to the dimension of the respective Jordan algebra associated to it. Hence, $e \in \mathcal{E}_{G_3}(e_0)$. □

Remark 5. In the light of the proof of the theorem above, since the are no Jordan subalgebras of M_3 of dimension 7 or 8, nor there are idempotent elements of Λ that have rank 6 or 7.

Corollary 1. For $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$, since e is a projection, $\dim e \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8\}$.

We prove a useful decomposition of elements of $Q(e)$ in the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *Let $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$. A matrix x belongs to $\in Q(e)$, if and only if, $x = h+y$, where $h \in H(e)$, $H(e)y = yH(e) = \hat{0}$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} y^k = \hat{0}$. This decomposition is unique.*

Proof. Suppose that $x = h + y \in \Lambda$, $h \in H(e)$, $y^k \xrightarrow{k} \hat{0}$, and $hy = yh = \hat{0}$. Because $h \in H(e)$, there is a sequence $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ for $k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$, such that $h^{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} e$. Then $x^{n_k} = h^{n_k} + y^{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} e$, i.e. $x \in Q(e)$.

On the other hand, let us suppose that $x \in Q(e) \subset \Lambda$. We have $x = exe + e^\perp xe + exe^\perp + e^\perp x^\perp$, where $e^\perp = \mathbf{1}_8 - e$. By Proposition 4, both $xe, xe \in H(e)$. Hence, $exe = xe = ex$, which means that $e^\perp xe = \hat{0}$, and also $exe^\perp = \hat{0}$. Let $h = exe$, and $y = e^\perp xe^\perp$. We have that $x = h + y$ and $hy = yh = \hat{0}$. Then $h^k = ex^ke$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies that $h \in Q(e)$. Since $h = he = eh$, $h \in H(e)$, again by Proposition 4. For $h' \in H(e)$, we have $h'y = h'ey = \hat{0} = yeh' = yh'$, i.e. $H(e)y = yH(e) = \hat{0}$. There is a sequence n_k of natural numbers such that $x^{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} e$. Hence, $h^{n_k} = ex^{n_k}e \xrightarrow{k} e^3 = e$. It follows that $y^{n_k} \xrightarrow{k} \hat{0}$, which is enough to say that $y^k \xrightarrow{k} \hat{0}$. Lastly, suppose that $x = h + y = h_2 + y_2$, where $h_2 \in H(e)$, and y_2 has the property: $h_2y_2 = y_2h_2 = \hat{0}$. For some sequence of natural numbers m_k, we have $ey_2 = \lim_k h_2^{m_k} y_2 = \hat{0}$. Then $h = ex = eh_2 + ey_2 = h_2$, and also $y = y_2$. □

For $x \in Q(e)$, since the decomposition described above is unique, let us denote by h_x and y_x the matrices such that $x = h_x + y_x$, $h_x \in H(e)$, $H(e)y_x = y_x H(e) = \hat{0}$, and $y_x^k \overset{k}{\to} \hat{0}$. The above lemma justifies the following definition.

Definition 2. Let $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$. We define: $Q_0(e) = \{x \in Q(e) \mid ||y_x|| < 1\}$. For $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots 8$, let $Q_i(e)$ be a set consisting of those $x = h_x + y_x \in Q(e)$, for which the largest singular value of y_x is equal to 1 with multiplicity i.

It is obvious that $Q(e) = \bigcup \{Q_i(e), i = 1, 2, \ldots, 8\} \cup Q_0(e)$, and these sets are disjoint (possibly empty).

Proposition 7. *Let $e \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$. If $\dim e \in \{5, 8\}$, then $Q(e) = Q_0(e)$. If $\dim e \leq 4$, then $Q_i(e) = \emptyset$ for $i \geq 5 - \dim e$.*

Proof. If $\dim e = 8$, then $e = \mathbf{1}_8$, and since by Remark 3, $Q(\mathbf{1}_8) = H(\mathbf{1}_8) = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$, obviously $Q(\mathbf{1}_8) = Q_0(\mathbf{1}_8)$. Suppose that $e \neq \mathbf{1}_8$ and $x = h_x + y_x \in Q(e)$. Then $x^t x = h_x^t h_x + y_x^t y_x = e + y_x^t y_x$, by Proposition 6; $y_x e = e y_x = \hat{0}$, and because for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(x^t x)^k \in \Lambda$, we have that $e + p = \lim_k x^t x \in \Lambda$, where p is a orthogonal projection onto the space spanned by eigenvectors of $y_x^t y_x$ with eigenvalue 1. Of course, $ep = pe = \hat{0}$, so the matrix $e + p \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$. It must be that $e + p \neq \mathbf{1}_8$, otherwise $x^t x = \mathbf{1}_8$, and hence $x \in \mathcal{G}(\Lambda) = Q(\mathbf{1}_8)$, a contradiction. If $\dim e = 5$, then $p = \hat{0}$, because by Theorem 2, there are no idempotent elements of Λ with rank 6 or 7. Hence $||y|| < 1$ and $x \in Q_0(e)$. By the same argument, for $\dim e \leq 4$, it is impossible that $\dim p + \dim e \geq 5$, so $Q_i(e) = \emptyset$, for $i \geq 5 - \dim e$, because by definition, $i = \dim p$. □

For the sake of convenience, let us introduce the following sequence of elements of $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$: $p_0 = \hat{0}, p_1 = P_8$, $p_2 = P_{38}$, $p_3 = P_{138}$, $p_4 = P_{1238}$, $p_5 = P_{13468}$.

Theorem 3. *Let i, j be integers such that $1 \leq i \leq 4$, $0 \leq j \leq 4$ and $i + j \leq 5$. If $x \in Q_i(p_j)$, then there exist $g_1, g_2 \in G_3$ and $z \in Q_0(p_{i+j})$ such that $x = g_1 z g_2$.*

Proof. Let $x \in Q_i(p_j)$ and $x = h_x + y_x$, as above. Since this decomposition is unique, we can write as in the proof of Lemma 3: $h_x = p_j x p_j$, and $y_x = p_j^\perp x p_j^\perp$, where $p_j^\perp = \mathbf{1}_8 - p_j$. Because $p_j = p_j^t$, then $hy^t = yh^t = \hat{0}$, and thus $xx^t = hh^t + yy^t = p_j + yy^t$, by Proposition 6. Let $R_1(p_i + y_0)R_2$ be the singular value decomposition of y, i.e. $R_1, R_2 \in \mathrm{O}(8)$ are orthogonal matrices, and y_0 is diagonal with the only possible non-zero entries $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{8-i}$, such that $1 > s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \ldots \geq s_{8-i} \geq 0$, and $p_i y_0 = y_0 p_i = \hat{0}$. Then for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(xx^t)^k = p_j + R_1(p_i + (y_0 y_0^t)^k)R_1^t \in \Lambda$, and because Λ is closed: $e_1 = p_j + R_1 p_i R_1^t = \lim_k (xx^t)^k \in \Lambda$. Also, since $hy^t = yh^t = \hat{0}$, we have that $p_j R_1 p_i R_1^t = R_1 p_i R_1^t p_j = \hat{0}$. It follows that e_1 is an idempotent and $\operatorname{rank} e_1 = i + j$. By Theorem 2, there is $g_1 \in G_3$ such that $e_1 = g_1 p_{i+j} g_1^t$. A similar argument, applied this time to $x^t x$, shows that there is $g_2 \in G_3$ such that the idempotent $e_2 = p_j + R_2^t p_i R_2 \in \Lambda$ could be written as $e_2 = g_2^t p_{i+j} g_2$. Let $z = g_1^t x g_2^t$. What remains to show is that $z \in Q_0(p_{i+j})$. It is evident that $z \in \Lambda$. One can easily check that $p_{i+j} z = z p_{i+j}$, and hence $z = h_z + y_z$, where $h_z = p_{i+j} z p_{i+j}$, and $y_z = p_{i+j}^\perp z p_{i+j}^\perp$, $p_{i+j}^\perp = \mathbf{1}_8 - p_{i+j}$. Because $h_z = p_{i+j} h_z = h_z p_{i+j}$, $h_z \in H(p_{i+j})$. Obviously, $hy_z = y_z h = \hat{0}$, for any $h \in H(p_{i+j})$. In addition, we have $y_z = g_1^t R_1 y_0 R_2 g_2^t$, so $||y_z^k|| \leq ||y_0||^k = s_1^k \overset{k}{\to} \hat{0}$. Therefore, by Lemma 3, $z \in Q(p_{i+j})$. Since $||y_z|| < 1$, $z \in Q_0(p_{i+j})$, which ends the proof. □

The main result of this paper could be captured in the following remark.

Corollary 2. Suppose that $x \in \mathrm{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$ and S_x is not a Jordan isomorphism. Then there exist $g_1, g_2 \in G_3$ such that $g_1^t x g_2^t \in Q_0(\hat{0}) \cup Q_0(P_8)$. In other words, either $||x|| < 1$, or $x = g_1(P_8 + y)g_2$, $yP_8 = P_8 y = \hat{0}$, and $||y|| < 1$.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathrm{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$. By Lemma 1 and Theorem 2, there is $g \in G_3$ such that $g^t x g \in Q(e_0)$, and $e_0 \in J$. Because S_x is an extremal positive map, then by [10, Theorem 2], $e_0 \in \{\hat{0}, P_8, \mathbf{1}_8\}$. By Remark 3, $x \notin Q(\mathbf{1}_8)$, hence $z = g^t x g \in Q(\hat{0}) \cup Q(P_8)$, and $z \in \mathrm{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$ (cf. [15, Lemma 3.1.2]). Suppose that $z \in Q(P_8)$. By Theorem 3, because $z \in \mathrm{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$, $z \notin Q_i(P_8)$ for $i \geq 1$ (see [10, Theorem 2]). Hence $z \in Q_0(P_8)$, and put $g_1 = g$ and $g_2 = g^t$. Then $x = g_1 z g_2$, and by Lemma 3, because $H(P_8) = \{P_8\}$ (see Remark 2), $z = P_8 + y$, $yP_8 = P_8 y = \hat{0}$, and $||y|| < 1$. On the other hand, if $z \in Q(\hat{0})$, then by the same reasoning either $z \in Q_0(\hat{0})$, and $||z|| < 1$, because $H(\hat{0}) = \{\hat{0}\}$, or $z \notin Q_0(\hat{0})$ and then there are $g_{01}, g_{02} \in G_3$ such that $g_{01} z g_{02} \in Q_0(P_8)$. Then put $g_1 = g g_{01}^t$ and $g_2 = g_{02}^t g^t$, and the assertion follows. □

We summarise the results presented above by saying that they allow to narrow the task of finding positive extremal and bistochastic maps on $M_3(\mathbb{C})$ to three specific groups; and examples in all these groups have been found previously. First, there are Jordan isomorphisms, represented by matrices from $Q(\mathbf{1}_8) = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$. Second, there are maps that could be called *strongly ergodic* [10], belonging to the class represented by $\{x \in Q_0(\hat{0}) \mid ||x|| = \frac{1}{2}\}$, of which the celebrated Choi map [3] is an example. For a generalised Choi map $\Phi[a, b, c]$:

$$\Phi[a,b,c](X) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} ax_{11} + bx_{22} + cx_{33} & -x_{12} & -x_{13} \\ -x_{21} & cx_{11} + ax_{22} + bx_{33} & -x_{23} \\ -x_{31} & -x_{32} & bx_{11} + cx_{22} + ax_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $X = (x_{ij})_{i,j=1}^3$, if we parametrise:

$$a(t) = \frac{(1-t)^2}{1-t+t^2}, \quad b(t) = \frac{t^2}{1-t+t^2}, \quad c(t) = \frac{1}{1-t+t^2}, \tag{2.5}$$

$0 \leq t < 1$, then $\Phi[a(t), b(t), c(t)]$ is an extremal bistochastic map on M_3. For $t = 0$, it is the map proposed originally by Choi, and for $t = 1$ it is a completely positive map. See the paper by K.-C. Ha and S.-H. Kye [6] for more details. The family of matrices x_t such that $S_{x_t} = \Phi[a(t), b(t), c(t)]$ is given by

$$x_t = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1-4t+t^2}{4(1-t+t^2)} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{3}(1-4t+t^2)}{4(1-t+t^2)} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}(1-4t+t^2)}{4(1-t+t^2)} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1-4t+t^2}{4(1-t+t^2)} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.6}$$

It is worth noting that each $x_t = \frac{1}{2} R_t$, where $R_t \in \mathrm{O}(8)$, as in Proposition 2.

Lastly, there are maps represented by elements of $Q_0(P_8)$, one example of which was proposed in [10]:

$$S_0(X) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(x_{11}+x_{22}) & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x_{13} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}(x_{11}+x_{22}) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x_{32} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x_{31} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x_{23} & x_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.7}$$

The matrix $x \in \Lambda$ such that $S_x = S_0$ is given by a diagonal matrix

$$x = \mathrm{diag}(0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2}}, 1). \tag{2.8}$$

We say that two elements $x, y \in \Lambda$ are equivalent if, and only if, there are $g_1, g_2 \in G_3$ such that $x = g_1 y g_2$. Then the task of finding elements in $\mathrm{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$, up to this equivalence relation, consists of:

1. finding all $R \in \mathrm{O}(8)$ such that $\frac{1}{2}R \in \mathrm{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$;
2. determining which elements $x \in \Lambda$, such that $\frac{1}{2} < ||x|| < 1$, belong to $\mathrm{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$;
3. finding all y, such that $yP_8 = P_8 y = \hat{0}$, $||y|| < 1$, and $P_8 + y \in \mathrm{Ext}_0(\Lambda)$.

In this paper, we have identified the *bistochastic* maps of M_3 with a subset $\Lambda \subset M_8(\mathbb{R})$, and studied its properties as a compact and convex semigroup. In applications to the quantum information theory, one would ideally seek the classification of *all* positive maps, not only the ones that preserve trace and identity. The assumption that a positive map has only one of those properties, i.e. it preserves either the trace or the identity, can be taken without loss of the generality. To assume, however, that a map is bistochastic does present a constraint to a certain degree. The semigroup of all positive maps that preserve, say, only the identity matrix, could be identified with a compact and convex semigroup within the product space $M_8(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^8$, together with the group multiplication that comes from a semi-direct product of $M_8(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathbb{R}^8$. This semigroup is almost certainly much more difficult to study, and we decided to start our investigation from a simpler case of the semigroup Λ. In the future, we hope that the methods proposed, together with some other, mostly geometric techniques, will allow to generalise the above result to a higher dimensional case and to bring the research closer to the final classification of extremal positive maps on matrix algebras.

References

[1] Y. A. Abramovich and C. D. Aliprantis. *Problems in operator theory*, volume 51. American Mathematical Society, 2002.

[2] M.-D. Choi. Some assorted inequalities for positive linear maps on C*-algebras. *Journal of Operator Theory*, 4(2):271–285, 1980.

[3] M.-D. Choi and T.-Y. Lam. Extremal positive semidefinite forms. *Mathematische Annalen*, 231(1):1–18, 1977.

[4] H. Chow. On compact affine semigroups. In *Semigroup Forum*, volume 11, pages 146–152. Springer, 1975.

[5] D. Chruściński and G. Sarbicki. Entanglement witnesses: construction, analysis and classification. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47(48):483001, 2014.

[6] K.-C. Ha and S.-H. Kye. Entanglement witnesses arising from exposed positive linear maps. *Open Systems and Information Dynamics*, 18(04):323–337, 2011.

[7] H. Hanche-Olsen and E. Størmer. *Jordan operator algebras*. Pitman Advanced Pub. Program, 1984.

[8] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki. Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions. *Physics Letters A*, 223(1-2):1–8, 1996.

[9] M. Miller and R. Olkiewicz. Horodeckis criterion of separability of mixed states in von Neumann and C*-algebras. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis, Quantum Probability and Related Topics*, 17(04):1450028, 2014.

[10] M. Miller and R. Olkiewicz. Stable subspaces of positive maps of matrix algebras. *Open Systems and Information Dynamics*, 22(02):1550011, 2015.

[11] M. Miller and R. Olkiewicz. Topology of the cone of positive maps on qubit systems. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 48(25):255203, 2015.

[12] A. Peres. Separability criterion for density matrices. *Physical Review Letters*, 77(8):1413–1415, 1996.

[13] S. Schwarz. On Hausdorff bicompact semigroups. *Czechoslovak Math. J*, 5(80):1–23, 1955.

[14] E. Størmer. Positive linear maps of operator algebras. *Acta Mathematica*, 110(1):233–278, 1963.

[15] E. Størmer. *Positive Linear Maps of Operator Algebras*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, 2013.

[16] S. L. Woronowicz. Positive maps of low dimensional matrix algebras. *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, 10(2):165–183, 1976.